Appl. No. 09/653,498 Amdt. dated March 9, 2005 Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2004

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1 – 24 have been examined. Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 13, and 15 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,057, 677 ("Bertagna") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,549,375 ("Pagliaccio"); Claims 7 – 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Pagliaccio further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,452 ("Gallery"); and Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Pagliaccio further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,873, 069 ("Reuhl").

The rejections are respectfully traversed. One aspect of the requirement for establishing a *prima facie* case under §103(a) is that the cited references "must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP 2143. It is respectfully noted that the specific limitations related to the mechanical structure of the security drawer assembly are not taught or suggested by the cited art. In particular, independent Claim 1 includes the following limitations, and independent Claim 6 includes similar limitations:

- b) a security drawer assembly removably mounted in the service cart, wherein the security drawer assembly includes:
 - a body having a sleeve with an open end and a passage open at said end;
- a body-mounting mechanism connected with said body for removably mounting the body within the service cart; and
- a security drawer movably mounted in the sleeve, the security drawer having locked and unlocked positions selectively providing access thereto and such that the body cannot be removed from the service cart when the security drawer is in the locked position;

Neither Bertagna nor Pagliaccio teaches or suggests a security drawer assembly having the specifically recited mechanical limitations. The Office Action relies on Pagliaccio for these limitations, noting the following:

¹ The Office Action indicates that Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bertagna in view of "Williams" further in view of Reuhl, but it is believed that the reference to Williams is erroneous in light of the Office Action's other references to Pagliaccio. Similarly, it is believed that the reference to "Williams" at p. 5, l. 13 of the Office Action is also intended to refer to Pagliaccio. This paper responds as though these references are to Pagliaccio rather than to Williams.

Appl. No. 09/653,498 Amdt. dated March 9, 2005 Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2004

Pagliaccio discloses a removable security drawer assembly (see Figure 1) including a drawer (13) removably mounted in a sleeve (18) and having locked and unlocked positions (see column 3, lines 31-33, "lock assembly"). (Office Action, p. 5).

It is respectfully noted, however, that Pagliaccio describes a computer storage drawer system that has a structure different from that recited in the claims. The computer storage drawer system of Pagliaccio is intended to be mounted internally in a computer drive bay (Pagliaccio, Col. 2, 1. 62). The Office Action appears to be drawing a correspondence between the system shown in Fig. 1 of Pagliaccio with the "security drawer assembly" recited in the claims; between housing 18 of Pagliaccio and the "body" recited in the claims; and between drawer 13 of Pagliaccio and the "security drawer" recited in the claims. But Pagliaccio does not disclose that the system be *removably* mounted within the computer drive bay so that the claim limitation requiring "a security drawer assembly *removably* mounted in the service cart" (emphasis added) is not disclosed. Instead, Pagliaccio teaches that screws 23 be used to mount the housing 18 to the chassis of the computer case 22 (*id.*, Col. 2, 1. 64). Screw mounting is a permanent form of mounting so that the system is not *removably* mounted within the computer drive bay.

If the Office is taking the position that screw mounting is a form of mounting that makes structures removable because it is possible to dismantle the structure by removing the screws, it is noted that even in that case, Pagliaccio then fails to disclose that "the body cannot be removed from the service cart when the security drawer is in the locked position." Even though Pagliaccio mentions the possibility of including a lock assembly, it does not teach that such a locking assembly affects the ability to remove the housing 18 from the drive bay. Instead, it appears that removal of the housing requires removal of the screws 23, irrespective of whether the lock assembly is included or not. The locking mechanism of Pagliaccio is evidently intended only to prevent the drawer 13 from being removed from the housing 18, not also to prevent the housing from being removed from the drive bay when in a locked position.

In addition, a *prima facie* case under §103(a) requires a demonstration that there is a motivation to combine or modify the cited art in the manner proposed. In this instance, the Office Action proposes to combine a reference that describes the sale and distribution of articles

Appl. No. 09/653,498 Amdt. dated March 9, 2005 Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2004

with an aircraft storage cart (Bertagna) with a reference that describes a drawer mounted in computer drive bay (Pagliaccio). The references are drawn from very different arts so that one of skill in an art relating to aircraft storage carts would have no motivation to consult a reference dealing with computer drive bays (nor, conversely, for one of skill in an art relating to computer drive bays to consult a reference dealing with aircraft storage carts).

For these reasons, Claims 1 and 6 are believed to be patentable over the cited art. The remaining claims are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependence from patentable claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick M. Boucher Reg. No. 44,037

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 303-571-4000 Fax: 415-576-0300

PMB:pmb 60418855 v1